

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Preliminary, Applicants wish to thank the examiner for granting an interview in which a monolithic limitation was discussed among other things. Pursuant to the Examiner's recommendations, Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 9, 10, 12 and 15-18 have been amended. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15-18, 22, 23, 27 and 29 will be pending. All remaining claims have been cancelled.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14-20, 22-26 and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that a "liner of chemically resistant fluorocarbon material is not described in the specification." (page 2). Claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's concern. Accordingly, all pending claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, written description.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 12, 15-16, 18-19, 22, and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jelinek. Also, claims 1, 3, 7-10, 15, 18-19, and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Custer. The amendments to claim 1 are believed to overcome these outstanding grounds for rejection. Specifically, none of these references alone discloses the claimed gasket. Accordingly, all pending claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §102.


Furthermore, claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer, Breaker, and Foster (applicants note that the Examiner during the interview indicated that Jelinek was also to be cited in this rejection). Claims 1-2, 8-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-19, 20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Forry in view of Breaker. Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Custer in view of Morris and over Forry and Breaker as applied to claim 8 in view of Morris. Claims 2, 14, 20 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jelinek in view of Breaker. The amendments to claim 1 are believed to overcome these outstanding grounds for rejection. Specifically, none of these references in combination discloses the claimed gasket. Accordingly, all pending claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, all rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By: 

Ted J. Ebersole  
Registration No. 51,641  
Direct No. (202) 879-3646

Paul L. Sharer  
Registration No. 36,004  
Direct No. (202) 879-5481

PLS/TJE/pmo  
Intellectual Property Group  
51 Louisiana Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 879-3646 Telephone  
(202) 626-1700 Facsimile

Date: August 30, 2006

Attachments: Petition for Extension of Time  
Change of Correspondence Address